26 July 1960

Dear Doc,

As per our meeting on the 14th, we have considered the problem of the material cycle. After discussion of this question by Rod, Don, Jules and myself, it is the recommendation of this contractor that the following arrangements be made: The Material Supplier and this contractor should jointly discuss the supply and take up cores, and design responsibility of any pieces which ultimately fly would be assigned to this contractor; it shall then be the responsibility of the Material Supplier to manufacture, maintain and overhaul such pieces of the flyable hardware as are required for initial spooling and unspooling; further, the Material Supplier shall be responsible for the design and manufacture of any shipping containers required, as well as any jigging, to assure compatibility of reused supply and take up cores with flyable hardware specifications. In actual operation, material will flow back and forth between the Material Supplier and operational site, and the responsibility of payload personnel will be restricted to unpacking, assembly and loading of a full supply core and the empty take up core into the flyable system, and the subsequent removal and packaging of the same material. Supply and take up cores always remain together in shipping containers when not in actual use.

If this should prove impractical there are two alternates which could be considered. First, the respooling possibility: In this arrangement there would be joint consultation only on the design of a supply core and the Material Supplier would be responsible only for the manufacture of this item. They would, using existing shipping containers, ship material on this item to an operational site at which point the material would be respooled onto an outer core. After an operation, the material would be back on a small core and could be returned to the Material Supplier. This method has the advantage of using existing shipping containers and less interface coordination between the Material Supplier and this contractor. It has, however, two very serious drawbacks since respooling is required and the system material path would have to be redesigned to permit supply from the outer core.

Second, the separate supply and take up method: In this method there will be joint consultation on design and the Material Supplier will be responsible for the manufacture of supply cores only. Supply cores would be shipped in existing shipping containers by the Material Supplier to the operational site. At the conclusion of a mission these inner cores would return in existing shipping

containers without material to the Material Supplier. The take up cores, on the other hand, would be manufactured by this contractor but would be housed in shipping containers designed and manufactured by the Material Supplier. At the conclusion of a mission, the core would proceed from the site to the Material Supplier where the material would be removed. The outer core would then be repackaged for shipment to this contractor (at either the M & O facility or the operational site) to be gaged, reworked and readied for reuse. This method has the advantage of reduced coordination between the Material Supplier and this contractor, avoids respooling and makes some use of existing shipping containers. However, it has the drawback of a complicated supply setup and also requires additional shipping containers.

This contractor wishes to make it very clear that coordination of this contractor and the Material Supplier is not viewed with any concern by this contractor; in fact, we would welcome the opportunity to work closely with the Material Supplier. However, it must be pointed out that there is always some risk in this kind of coordination that unclear definitions of responsibility can create disagreements and impede the efficient and reliable supply we all desire. It is for this reason only that we have listed coordination as a potential drawback to any of the above described methods.

Best regards

Milt

Milt

MDR:mb